Proposed Funding Compromise

Support infrastructure financing package to include: bonding $100 million in GO Bonds, wheel tax increases, gas tax increases (occupation tax) and utility fee increases

If MIFC report includes:

- $1 million a year for sidewalk rehab ($500,00 in general budget and $3 million in GO bonding)

- Statement of a goal to provide funding to move residential street and arterial rehab to 30 cycle for residential and 15 year cycle for arterials, if on-going survey of street conditions indicates rehabilitation warranted. Current estimated cycle 40 to 50 years and 30 to 35 years respectively.

- An overt statement by the MIFC that impact fees are a critical component of the community compromise reached to finance infrastructure development and that in event that impact fees are reversed by the courts, then they must be replaced by another mechanism to raise a similar proportion of the overall financing needed to support infrastructure development from the development sector and/or the direct beneficiaries of new development or the recommendations and community compromises outlined in the MIFC report are null and void.

- The MIFC report should support and recommend that the current impact fee schedule be revised to clearly reflect that the impact fee structure will be on-going adjusted for construction index inflation costs.

- Recommendation that water and wastewater impact fees have further 12% annual increments after the end of the current impact fee increment schedule until they reach approximately 75% of the maximum allowable impact fee costs for this sector (approximately 7 years). This would then have the streets at 75%, water and wastewater at 75% and parks at 100%.

- A statement of policy that if future infrastructure financing gaps occur, then infrastructure funding allocations should roughly follow a priority of 1) existing city and neighborhood maintenance and rehabilitation, 2) projects of community-wide benefit, and 3) infrastructure needed to support growth.

- Language in the report that calls attention to the implications and public policy choices and costs related to attempting to provide infrastructure service to more land area for development than would be reasonably expected to be occupied by our projected 1.5% growth rate.